

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough search of the present application, but respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-26 and 28-29 are currently being amended. Claims 30-38 are being added. After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-38 are now pending in this application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 15-18, 22, 23, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In section 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 15-18, 22, 23, 26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0099246 to Cox *et al.* (Cox). Applicants respectfully submit that Cox fails to teach, suggest, or disclose all of the elements of at least Claims 1 and 15, as amended.

Independent Claims 1 and 15, as amended, recite in part:

configuring a temporary address for an interface of a sub-element of a network element, the network element comprising a control module and the sub-element;

retrieving an identifier of the network element from the control module; and

defining a second address for the interface of the sub-element based on the retrieved identifier of the network element and the temporary address.

Independent Claim 29, as amended, recites in part:

a logical network comprising at least two network elements, a network element of the at least two network elements comprising at least one sub-element and a control module;

a configuring means for configuring a temporary address for an interface of a sub-element of the at least one sub-element and to define an address for the interface of the sub-element based on an identifier of the network element retrieved by a retrieving means from the control module and the temporary address.

Cox is directed to a router that “can automatically self assess which of its interfaces are coupled to an active communication link and then identify which interface needs a new network address prefix.” (Abstract). More particularly, Cox teaches that the router determines if the active communication link has “other router support.” (Para. [0011]). If the active communication link has other router support, “the router can automatically self configure the router interface that couples to that communication link with an IPv6 address composed from an IPv6 address prefix given by another router....” (Para. [0011]). On the other hand, “[w]hen no address prefix is available, the router can automatically flag that interface as needing a new address prefix.” (Para. [0011]). If an interface is flagged, Cox states:

When the router 104 cannot detect 301 a received address prefix advertisement from another router, optionally, the router 104 can transmit a solicitation for such an advertisement on the communication link that couples to the interface being processed. Such solicitation messages are allowed by endpoints and should elicit a corresponding network address prefix advertisement from any other configured router on that link. If the router 104 detects 306 a response to such a solicitation, the address prefix portion of that response can be stored 302 and later utilized to autoconfigure 206 (FIG. 2) that particular interface. When no such response is detected 306 , or when this optional solicitation step has not been used, the router 104 can determine 307 whether sufficient time has been expended on this particular interface. If not, the process can repeat. Otherwise, the process continues as described in FIG. 2 by flagging the interface 207 as indeed needing a new address prefix.

(Para. [0020], with emphasis added through underlining). Therefore, Cox teaches a new router that can autoconfigure an interface based on an existing routers IPv6 prefix. If the new router interface is not connected to an existing router, the new router may send solicitation messages to try to obtain an IPv6 prefix for that interface.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Cox fails to teach or suggest “configuring a temporary address for an interface of the sub-element,” as recited by Claims 1 and 15 and similarly recited in Claim 29. (Emphasis added through underlining). Furthermore, Cox fails to teach or suggest “retrieving an identifier of the network element

from the control module,” as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Moreover, Cox fails to teach or suggest “defining a second address for the interface of the sub-element based on the retrieved identifier of the network element and the temporary address,” as recited by Claims 1 and 15 and similarly recited in Claim 29. (Emphasis added through underlining). For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Cox fails to anticipate independent Claims 1, 15, and 29, as amended. Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11, 16-18, 22, 23, and 26 depend from one of Claims 1 and 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 15-18, 22, 23, 26, and 29.

II. Rejection of Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 14, 19-21, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In section 4 of the Office Action, Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 14, 19-21, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,333,461 to Thubert *et al.* (Thubert). Applicants respectfully disagree because Cox and Thubert, alone and in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or disclose all of the elements of at least Claims 1 and 15. Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 14, 19-21, 24, and 25 depend from one of Claims 1 and 15.

As discussed above, Cox fails to teach all of the elements recited in Claims 1 and 15. Thubert states:

These and other needs are attained by the present invention, where a mobile router is configured for generating a local router prefix (i.e., a null or invalid address prefix that is not reachable via a wide area network) for use by mobile nodes that attempt to attach to the mobile router. The mobile router, having attached to an attachment router by using a care-of address that specifies an address prefix assigned by the attachment router, outputs a router advertisement message that specifies the null address prefix that is not reachable from a wide area network (i.e., via the attachment router). Upon receiving a message from a mobile host that includes a source address field specifying a mobile host care-of address that includes the null address prefix, the mobile router adds the mobile host care-of address to a reverse routing header and inserts its own care-of address into the source address field. The message is output to its destination with the reverse routing header, ensuring the

identity (i.e., IPv6 address) of the mobile router remains anonymous in the wide area network.

(Col. 3, lines 45-63, with emphasis added through underlining). Thus, Thubert teaches an anonymous routing method wherein a mobile router receives a message from a mobile host and adds the mobile host's care-of address to a reverse routing header and inserts its own care-of address into the source address field prior to outputting the message.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Thubert fails to teach or suggest "configuring a temporary address for an interface of the sub-element," as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Furthermore, Thubert fails to teach or suggest "retrieving an identifier of the network element from the control module," as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Moreover, Thubert fails to teach or suggest "defining a second address for the interface of the sub-element based on the retrieved identifier of the network element and the temporary address," as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Thubert fails to cure the deficiencies associated with Cox. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 14, 19-21, 24, and 25 which depend from Claims 1 and 15.

III. Rejection of Claims 13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198413 to Smith *et al.* (Smith). Applicants respectfully disagree because Cox and Smith, alone and in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or disclose all of the elements of at least Claims 1 and 15. Claims 13 and 28 depend from Claims 1 and 15, respectively.

As discussed above, Cox fails to teach all of the elements recited in Claims 1 and 15. Smith states:

The call manager application 270, in response to the user input signal including a calling number, accesses a plurality of call number information stored in the categorized number memory 295 for use in operation of the call manager application 270 . For example, when the device user enters the calling number

“911” and presses SEND using the user interface 265, the call manager application 270 accesses the categorized number memory 295 in either or both the memory 245 and/or the memory storage device 205. When the number “911” is stored as an emergency phone number with a voice call type associated with it, the call manager application 270 sends an application signal to the processor 240 notifying the processor 240 that the call type for this call is a voice call.

(Para. [0044], with emphasis added through underlining). Thus, Smith generally teaches a method of looking up a dialed number in a database to determine what type connection should be made. Such a method assures that an emergency call will be made according to a proper call type. (See, e.g., para. [0007]).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith fails to teach or suggest “configuring a temporary address for an interface of the sub-element,” as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Furthermore, Smith fails to teach or suggest “retrieving an identifier of the network element from the control module,” as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Moreover, Smith fails to teach or suggest “defining a second address for the interface of the sub-element based on the retrieved identifier of the network element and the temporary address,” as recited by Claims 1 and 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Smith fails to cure the deficiencies associated with Cox. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 13 and 28 which depend from Claims 1 and 15, respectively.

IV. Rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In section 6 of the Office Action, Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0179508 to Thubert *et al.* (Thubert II). Applicants respectfully disagree because Cox and Thubert II, alone and in combination, fail to teach, suggest, or disclose all of the elements of at least Claim 15. Claim 27 depends from Claim 15.

As discussed above, Cox fails to teach all of the elements recited in Claim 15. Thubert II states:

These and other needs are attained by the present invention, where a source IPv6 mobile node is configured for establishing an IPv4 connection with a destination IPv6 router having an IPv4 interface and configured as a Mobility Anchor Point (MAP) according to Hierarchical Mobile IPv6 Protocol. The MAP is configured for assigning a valid IPv6 care-of address to the IPv6 mobile node in response to receiving an IPv4 packet carrying an IPv6 packet requesting a valid care-of address. The IPv4 packet includes IPv4 source and destination addresses, a transport layer source port and transport layer destination port, and a synthetic tag address in the IPv6 source address field. The synthetic tag address includes a unique identifier that enables the MAP to associate the valid IPv6 care-of address with the IPv6 mobile node. Hence, the MAP is configured for forwarding an IPv6 packet, carried via the IPv4 connection from the source IPv6 mobile node, onto an IPv6 network with an IPv6 source address field that specifies the assigned valid IPv6 care-of address. Hence, the MAP enables the IPv6 mobile node to send and receive IPv6 messages via an IPv4 network, regardless of whether the IPv4 network includes a NAT that separates the source and destination IPv6 mobile routers.

(Para. [0021], with emphasis added through underlining). Accordingly, Thubert II teaches an IPv6 mobile node that can send and receive IPv6 messages via an IPv4 network, regardless of whether the IPv4 network includes a NAT that separates the source and destination IPv6 mobile routers.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Thubert II fails to teach or suggest “configuring a temporary address for an interface of the sub-element,” as recited by Claim 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Furthermore, Thubert II fails to teach or suggest “retrieving an identifier of the network element from the control module,” as recited by Claim 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). Moreover, Thubert II fails to teach or suggest “defining a second address for the interface of the sub-element based on the retrieved identifier of the network element and the temporary address,” as recited by Claim 15. (Emphasis added through underlining). For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Thubert II fails to cure the deficiencies associated with Cox. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 27 which depends from Claim 15.

V. New Claims 30-38

Applicants have added new Claims 30-38 to further protect aspects of the present application. New Claims 30-32 depend from Claim 29. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 30-32 for the at least the reasons discussed in Section I. above.

New Claims 34-38 depend from new independent Claim 33, which recites in part:

determining if information about a position of a module within a base station is available;

if the information about the position of the module within the base station is available, creating a link layer address based on the position of the module; and

if the information about the position of the module within the base station is not available, creating the link layer address based on a serial number of the module.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the above discussed references teach or suggest the elements presented in at least new Claim 33. In particular, Applicants submit that each reference fails to teach, suggest, or disclose anything related to creating a link layer address based on a position of the module or a serial number of the module. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 33-38.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for

such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Callie M. Bell
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,989

Date May 20, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23524
Telephone: (608) 258-4263
Facsimile: (608) 258-4258